Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study
Net Benefits Analysis: Stakeholder Involvement Report

FINAL VERSION
June 26, 2006

– This page intentionally blank –

Acknowledgements

Numerous individual and organizations contributed to the successful implementation of the net benefits analysis' stakeholder involvement efforts. Thanks and warmest regards are extended to each.

CLAMP Steering Committee members

- Bob Van Schoorl, Port of Olympia
- Dick Blinn, Thurston County
- Dick Wallace, WA Department of Ecology
- Jeff Dickison, Squaxin Island Tribe
- Joe Hyer, City of Olympia
- Neil McClanahan, Co-Chair, City of Tumwater
- Peter Antolin, Co-Chair, WA Department of General Administration
- Scott Robinson, WA Department of Natural Resources
- Sue Patnude, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife

CLAMP Steering Committee staff

- Curtis Tanner, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Nathaniel Jones, WA Department of General Administration
- Steven Morrison, Thurston Regional Planning Council

Additional CLAMP member agency staff

- Margen Carlson, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Perry Lund, WA Department of Ecology

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Coastal Services Center staff

- Thomas G. Safford
- Zac Hart

We also thank the NOAA Coastal Services Center for contributing grant funding to complete this project.

Stakeholder Meetings Facilitator

- John Kliem, Creative Community Solutions

Focus Group Participants

- Allen Miller, Heritage Park Development Association
- Angela Ruiz, Citizen
- David Bills, Tumwater Area Chamber of Commerce
- Donna Nickerson, Black Hills Audubon Society
- Donna Smith, Citizen
- Doug DeForest, Thurston County Chamber of Commerce
- Emily Piper Sanford, Citizen
- Emily Ray, Citizen
- Eve Fagergren, Citizen
- Frank Anderson, Citizen
- Gary Franklin, South Capitol Neighborhood Association
- John Demeyer, Olympia Yacht Club
- John Lynch, Chambers Lake Homeowners Association
- Keith Johnson, Chambers Lake Homeowners Association
- Loris Fenske, Olympia Heritage Commission
- Naki Stevens, People for Puget Sound
- Nancy Stevenson, Tumwater Historic Preservation Commission
- Oscar Soule, Citizen
- Paul Allen, Friends of the Deschutes Estuary
- Paul Seabert, Olympia Downtown Association
- Paul Spivak, Citizen
- Randy Weeks, Citizen
- Renee Sunde, Thurston County Economic Development Council
- Sara Carter, South Sound Green, Thurston Conservation District
- Tamara Garcia, Thurston County Visitors Convention Bureau
- Tom Hanson, Capital Lakefair

The Olympia Yacht Club

The Olympia School District's Knox Center

The Olympian

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

The successful exploration of coastal management and restoration opportunities depends upon having quality scientific information about the natural, physical, and social context in which these activities take place. Collecting natural and physical scientific data has become a part of virtually all of these types of projects. Increasingly, federal and state agencies have also begun examining the economic costs and benefits associated with different management actions. The majority of these efforts have focused on analyzing the costs of potential restoration options and providing comparisons of the expenses associated with different management scenarios. Although most agencies would like to gather information about both the costs and the benefits of particular activities, quantifying the full range of benefits provided by natural areas can be costly and requires complex economic modeling (Lipton & Wellman 1995, de Groot et al. 2002). Because of these difficulties, detailed analysis of social and economic benefits has not been a regular part of restoration planning.

Nevertheless, it can be valuable to decision makers to have access to information about the types of benefits that may be derived from a particular ecosystem under different management scenarios. It is increasingly acknowledged that information about the human and social context is critical for evaluating natural resource management efforts (Casagrande 1997b, Heinz Center 2002, Thayer et al. 2005, Waage 2003).

In Olympia, Washington, a multi-jurisdictional committee that provides guidance on the management of Capitol Lake has recognized the value of such human and social information. The Capitol Lake Adaptive Management (CLAMP) Steering Committee is exploring a variety of management options for the lake. The lake was created by damming the Deschutes River, and it is thought that restoring estuary processes, such as tidal inundation, could eliminate several of the problems associated with maintaining the lake environment. In order to explore this possibility, the CLAMP Steering Committee initiated a Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study (DEFS), which includes a socio-economic study: the Net Benefits Analysis (NBA).

During the initial discussions of the DEFS and the NBA, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Coastal Services Center (NOAA CSC) staff recognized the need to: 1) identify ways to gather input from non-governmental groups, the business community, and citizens about the types of benefits they derive from the Deschutes Basin, and 2) develop a formal social and economic assessment that would integrate both quantitative and qualitative estimates of the value of these benefits. Integrating local input in both the project development and analysis stages has been found to be a superior approach for involving the public in natural resource management decision-making (Casagrande 1997, Heinz Center 2002, Imperial 2005, McCool & Gutherie 2001). These types of studies have also shown that approaches that merely present management options for public comment often lead to conflicts between different interest groups. Based on these experiences, NOAA CSC and WDFW staff worked to develop an approach that would engage local and regional stakeholders in each stage of the net-benefits assessment.

Conventionally, studies of the social and economic benefits of natural resources have focused on attaching dollar values to goods and services that are bought and sold in markets (e.g., fish or timber) and quantifying "non-market values" (e.g., the benefits of wetlands in improving water quality or the value of an undeveloped forest or beach for recreation). Further, government agencies often identify which goods and services should become the focus for these valuation studies. These methods, however, do not always capture the full range of values that are important to local communities. In addition, the high cost of conducting purely quantitative non-market

valuation studies has meant that they are not always feasible given the limited resources available for restoration and other coastal management efforts.

To avoid these problems, the DEFS developed an approach wherein local stakeholders identify the types of benefits for which quantitative market and non-market valuation studies will be completed, and also highlight particular benefits that need to be characterized through qualitative analysis. This approach is consistent with effective natural resource management and coastal restoration efforts in other regions (Casagrande 1997, Driver 1996, Lipton & Wellman 1995, Page 1997, Thayer et al. 2005). The results of this process are outlined in the subsequent sections of this report.

II. Background

Capitol Lake, located in Olympia, Washington, is an impoundment of the Deschutes River. The lake was created in 1951 by erecting a dam to retain fresh water from the river before it joins the salt water of Budd Inlet and the Puget Sound. The state created the lake to realize a reflecting surface for the Capitol Building, which was a feature of the site plan that the architectural firm of Wilder and White created for the Washington State Capitol Campus in 1911. The Washington Department of General Administration (GA) has taken responsibility for maintaining and operating the lake and the associated dam and Deschutes Parkway since their creation in 1951.

The following excerpt from the Draft 2005 Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan Annual Report describes the evolution of Capitol Lake maintenance and adaptive management.

> In the early 1970s and into the 1980s lake management activities were intensified with efforts to address sedimentation, water quality, and public recreation. During this period, the state dredged the lake twice, once in 1979 and again in 1986. Yearly estimates of sediment accumulation in the lake are from 29,000 to 55,000 cubic yards per year. Attempts in the mid-1990s to secure maintenance dredging permits, to keep up with sedimentation, encountered significant environmental challenges. At that time, immediate dredging was abandoned in lieu of a more comprehensive lake management approach.
>
> When the state sought permits for the construction of Heritage Park in 1996, it became clear that a limited management strategy was no longer feasible. Lake managers needed to balance the sometimes competing demands of fisheries, habitat, water quality, public use, flood management, and aesthetics. While Capitol Lake is only a small part of the Deschutes River watershed, it is necessary to consider the larger ecosystem and respond to a broader range of community interests in managing the basin.
>
> In 1997, GA established a partnership with state natural resource agencies and local governments with permitting and/or management responsibility for Capitol Lake or its watershed. The nine jurisdictions serving on the *Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (CLAMP) Steering Committee* include the following:
>
> - State Department of Ecology
> - State Department of Fish and Wildlife
> - State Department of General Administration
> - State Department of Natural Resources
> - City of Olympia
> - Port of Olympia
> - Squaxin Island Tribe
> - Thurston County
> - City of Tumwater
>
> GA has provided staff and resources for the Steering Committee's operations. In addition, the other jurisdictions have provided technical staff assistance to both the Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committees. Still evolving its role, the Steering Committee was established to provide guidance to GA on lake management and has recognized a shared interest and responsibility for the lake's future. While the day-to-day management of this resource remains with GA, member entities are contributing dollars, staff, and other resources to assure that the lake will be healthy and fulfill the public's expectations.

> In June 1999, the Director of GA adopted the first *Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan (1999-2001)*. Established for an interim two-year period, the plan was to ensure that operations, maintenance, and capital investments were coordinated so that limited financial resources could be used in an effective and efficient manner. A new draft CLAMP plan was reviewed by the public in summer 2002, with the CLAMP Steering Committee's recommendation to adopt that fall. The Director of GA forwarded the plan to the State Capitol Committee, which adopted the *Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan - A Vision for the Next Ten Years: 2003-2013* in December 2002.
>
> The CLAMP 10-Year Plan identifies 14 Management Objectives… In any one year, there may be several activities where substantial progress has been made. (Draft 2005 CLAMP Annual Report)

A. Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study

The CLAMP Steering Committee seeks to provide information and guidance to GA to support a thorough discussion of the possibilities for managing Capitol Lake. It is possible that restoring the Deschutes River estuary (an area where freshwater from a river or stream mixes with saltwater in a bay or estuary) may alleviate some of the problems related to current lake management. While we have more than fifty years of experience and studies related to maintaining the lake environment, we have very little information about how an estuary would function here today. Thus, the second objective of the CLAMP 10-Year Plan is to carry out a study to determine whether it is feasible to restore estuary processes to the Capitol Lake.

The Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study (DEFS) consists of several components, each of which contributes to our understanding of the various costs and benefits associated with restoring estuary processes to Capitol Lake. Some of these components analyze physical attributes of an estuary. A bathymetric study surveyed the shape of the bottom of the lake, and the hydraulic and sediment transport model predicts how sediment would move and be distributed if estuary processes were restored. Other portions of the DEFS provide ecological analyses of a restored Deschutes River estuary. The reference estuary study examined other South Puget Sound estuaries to help us understand how they function, as well as the types and amounts of habitat that might result from restoring estuary processes. The engineering design and cost estimate study will use existing data, as well as that generated in other components of the DEFS, to develop feasible estuary restoration design alternatives and predict how those alternatives will affect existing infrastructure and what they will cost. Finally, the net benefits analysis will elucidate the socio-cultural and economic effects of restoring estuary processes in the urban setting of downtown Olympia. Each of these components will be subject to independent technical and community reviews.

B. Net Benefits Analysis

While ecological studies are an almost obligatory foundation for considering restoration activities, studies of social and economic aspects of restoration are more rare, even though examining and incorporating socio-economic information can lead to a more effective and sustainable decision. In recognition of this fact, the net benefits analysis (NBA) was included in the DEFS from an early stage. The net benefits analysis asks, "How do we expect social, economic, and environmental values in the Deschutes Basin to change if estuary processes are restored?" Discussions about integrating different types of social and economic information into the DEFS began in early 2005. Perry Lund, then project manager for the DEFS, approached the Human Dimensions Program at the NOAA Coastal Services Center (NOAA CSC) to inquire about possible collaboration in the net benefits analysis component of the study.

In March 2005, NOAA CSC and Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) staff met in Olympia to talk about the objectives of the DEFS, the types of social and economic data that could be included in the net-benefits portion of the study, and the technical and financial resources that

would necessary for this component. NOAA CSC and Ecology staff recognized the need to expand the initial scope of the net-benefits assessment to include a broader range of social and economic data and to develop a process that would integrate local and regional stakeholders into the assessment effort.

Following these meetings, the director of the Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program within Ecology made a formal request, on behalf of CLAMP, for assistance from the NOAA CSC. In response, NOAA CSC staff met with members of the CLAMP technical work group to discuss the development of a proposal and work plan for a NOAA-funded project that would support the NBA. During this period, the leadership of the CLAMP technical work group rotated to the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Throughout the fall of 2005, NOAA CSC and WDFW staff developed a project plan and finalized a scope of work for the stakeholder involvement portion of the NBA. A contract was completed in January 2006 and the stakeholder involvement process began in March 2006.

III. Stakeholder Involvement Process

A. Planning and Development

WDFW and NOAA CSC staff continued their collaboration in planning the community involvement process and added the services of facilitator John Kliem. The CLAMP Steering Committee reviewed and approved major planning milestones, as well as staff recommendations about correspondence and outreach. The primary planning activities included refining objectives, creating a general framework, and identifying participants.

1. Objectives

The first planning task was to clarify the objectives of the community involvement process. Initially, the objective was quite general: the CLAMP Steering Committee wished to have the community make recommendations about the kinds of goods and services that should be analyzed in the Net Benefits Analysis (NBA). Staff from several of the CLAMP Steering Committee member organizations spent time considering the wording of the objective and how the community participants might understand that wording. Eventually, this discussion resulted in three distinct objectives for the stakeholder involvement process.

The first objective was to "Identify attributes related to the Deschutes Basin that should be analyzed in the Net Benefits Analysis." The most difficult idea to communicate is what was meant by "attributes". The goal was to get community participants to identify tangible products or services, and tangible or intangible experiences or feelings that the Deschutes Basin provides that are important to them. "Ecosystem goods and services" is often used in this kind of analysis, but some felt that this phrase was too evocative of conventional economic analyses, which rarely include non-market and subjective attributes, despite their importance to a community. The wording above was used variously in written and spoken communication with community participants.

The second objective was to "Recommend whether the identified attributes should be analyzed quantitatively or qualitatively." Although there are methodologies for determining the values of non-market goods and services, it can be expensive to have such analyses done. The CLAMP Steering Committee had a finite amount of money with which to conduct the NBA, and the quantitative/qualitative recommendations from the community would help sort the data for analysis.

The third objective was to "Suggest ways for the community to be involved in making a final decision about the long-term management of Capitol Lake." A detailed project implementation plan for the DEFS now anticipates the various scientific studies will be completed by mid-2007, and

a final report will be delivered in 2008. Many in the general community were anxious to turn their attention to the decision making process that follows completion of the study. Would it continue to be a lake? Would estuary processes be restored? It made sense to channel that interest into creating a brainstorm of public involvement suggestions, thereby improving public outreach and involvement in the future.

Although communicating these objectives was very important, it was equally important to be clear about what would not happen as a part of this process. Because the community was so interested in the eventual decision making, and because opinions ran deep and strong about what that decision should be, staff knew it would be tempting to use this process as a forum for debate. While that discussion would be valuable to the community, this process needed to result in some specific information to guide the completion of the impending NBA, which would later inform that very discussion. Thus, at several points during the process, staff and the facilitator emphasized that this process was not a forum for debate, rather a way for the community to help define the content of the NBA.

2. General Framework

The second planning task was to determine how to achieve these objectives. WDFW and NOAA CSC staff and the facilitator designed a series of meetings with two major components: two small working group sessions followed by a large public meeting. Each of these meetings was facilitated and a professional note-taker recorded the proceedings and provided summary notes. The meetings were held in the evening at locations in downtown Olympia.

> "**focus group**: A small group selected from a wider population and sampled, as by open discussion, for its members' opinions about or emotional response to a particular subject or area, used especially in market research or political analysis."
>
> *The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition*. 2000.

The smaller working group was called the Focus Group. This sample of community members provided specific responses and opinions regarding the scope of the NBA, quantitative and qualitative analysis, and future public involvement. The public involvement process started with a small group because staff predicted it would take two meetings to achieve the objectives, and that it would be important to have consistent participation from the first meeting to the second. It would be difficult to assure this continuity between meetings with an open house meeting style. Additionally, it was important for the Focus Group to develop a sense of intimacy and teamwork with the facilitator and with each other so that they could move beyond debate and focus on the common objectives at hand. The Focus Group created the first draft of Deschutes Basin attributes that alternately guided and was added to by the community.

The two Focus Group meetings were followed by a public meeting. This meeting gave the broader community an opportunity to review the Focus Group's work, identify additional Deschutes Basin attributes, and add to the public involvement brainstorm. Although the public meeting was only one night, a local television station (Thurston Community Television) provided coverage of the meeting and broadcast the footage nine times over the subsequent two months.

3. Participation

Focus Group participants were identified by both targeting local organizations and soliciting interested citizens. Staff created a list of invitees (Box 1) using an early draft of a CLAMP communication strategy that identified local and regional constituent groups. Although Capitol Lake is located in Olympia, it represents the State of Washington through its inclusion in the Capitol Campus. Thus, a regional perspective was an important facet of the Focus Group. The

invitation list included local and regional business and trade associations, local and regional environmental groups, an educational organization, neighborhood and historic groups, and a local tribe. The CLAMP Steering Committee recommended several additional groups. The local paper ran an article that outlined the community involvement effort and solicited interested individuals to contact WDFW staff. Ten citizens responded to this call for participation.

Box 1. Focus Group Invitation List

- Black Hills Audubon Society
- Capitol Lakefair
- Chambers Lake Homeowners Association
- Economic Development Council
- Friends of the Deschutes Estuary
- Heritage Park Association
- Olympia Downtown Association
- Olympia Heritage Commission
- Olympia Yacht Club
- People for Puget Sound
- Project Green, Thurston Conservation District
- Puget Sound Anglers South Sound Chapter
- South Capitol Neighborhood Association
- Squaxin Island Tribe
- Thurston County Chamber of Commerce
- Tumwater Chamber of Commerce
- Tumwater Historic Preservation Committee
- Visitor Convention Bureau
- Individual citizens

Staff communicated with potential Focus Group participants in several ways. The CLAMP Steering Committee sent an invitation letter and background information to each individual and the leader of each organization. The letter requested an RSVP so that staff could plan effectively. This also allowed staff to emphasize the importance assuring continuity by having one person from an organization attend both meetings. WDFW staff spoke on the phone or via email with each organization and individual, and 25 of the 28 organizations and individuals confirmed their participation and attended the first meeting.

Public meeting participants were sought through a combination of advertisement, distributing fliers, and email distribution. The public meeting was advertised in the local paper, on local radio stations, and fliers were posted at locations around town, including the local college. Fliers were distributed in hard copy and electronically to Focus Group participants and via email to several Capitol Lake distribution lists. Many recipients forwarded the flier within their organization or to additional distribution lists, creating another layer of awareness.

B. Meeting Methods

Facilitator John Kliem employed the Institute of Cultural Affairs' Workshop Method™ (Standfield 2002). This method generates team consensus, creativity, and responsibility, and works well for building consensus in a diverse group. It relies on individual, team, and full group work to brainstorm a list of ideas, find relationships among the ideas, and discover greater insight into their meaning.

One of the most important steps in the Workshop Method™ is to create a focus question. The focus question drives the whole workshop by triggering the brainstorm and providing direction at various other points in the workshop. Thus, the focus question must illuminate the issue and also encourage imaginative thinking.

It often helps to consider both the rational objective (What is the product or result needed?) and the experiential objective (What do you want the group to experience through the workshop?) when creating a focus question. The rational objective of the Focus Group, as stated above, was to have participants create a list of attributes or values that they associate with the Deschutes Basin and (at the second meeting) make recommendations about quantitative/qualitative analysis and public involvement. The experiential objective for the group was to enjoy working together in a cooperative atmosphere to evoke creative thinking and a sense of satisfaction from creating a visible product.

The facilitator also made use the concept of "mental maps", developed by sociologist Dr. Lorraine Garkovich, in creating the focus question (Garkovich, online). Garkovich explains that, "Each

landowner or person with an interest in the prospective use of a given piece of land has in mind a certain future for that parcel which is linked somehow with his/her own well-being." Further, she explains that,

> Land uses affect people's "mental map" of their community. In other words, the ways in which land is used and the physical arrangement of these uses directly shape the mental map we develop and indirectly affect our definitions of the desirability of our community as a place to live and work. These mental maps come to define the essential nature of the community… (Garkovich, online)

The notion of mental maps complements the rational objective of the Focus Group: to identify attributes or values related to the Deschutes Basin that should be analyzed in the NBA. Considering the two together led to the focus question, "How does the Deschutes Basin fit within your mental map of our community?" The concept of mental maps, the focus question, and a homework assignment to consider these ideas were included in a letter of introduction from the facilitator to each Focus Group participant.

1. Focus Group, Meeting One

The first Focus Group meeting was held on Tuesday, March 07, 2006, from 6 o'clock pm until 9 o'clock pm at the Olympia Yacht Club. After the 25 Focus Group participants and various staff introduced themselves, WDFW and GA staff gave three informal presentations to provide some context for the evening's activities. These presentations covered the history and management of Capitol Lake, basic estuary information, and the basics of the DEFS and the NBA. After staff explained how the Focus Group's work fit into the NBA, they retreated to the edge of the room to observe and did not participate in the remainder of the workshop.

The activities for the evening were designed to follow the Workshop Method™. The facilitator asked the group to list at least 10 images or examples of how the Deschutes Basin fits within their mental map of the community. He used examples such as 'provides recreational fishing', 'supports downtown businesses', and 'provides aesthetic values' to stimulate the group's thinking. He also used a large aerial photo of the Deschutes Basin to delineate the area the group should be thinking about. A question from a Focus Group participant led staff to clarify that the group shouldn't limit their ideas to values associated with either a lake or an estuary. Rather, the group should identify attributes that important to them, and these could be attributes they experienced in the past, experience currently, or would like to see in the Deschutes Basin in the future.

Subsequently, the group divided into pairs and collaborated to write their top five to seven ideas onto five-inch by eight-inch index cards. These cards created a tangible record of the group's work, and were used throughout the remainder of the stakeholder involvement process. The facilitator then led the group through several rounds of posting the attributes on the wall for the whole group to see and understand and then sorting the attributes into related clusters.

Once the group agreed on the clustering of the attributes, they created a title for each cluster that conveyed its essence. The facilitator helped the group do this by explaining, "You can think about all the cards we have up on the wall as telling a story about the Deschutes Basin, and each of our clusters as chapters in that book. What title would you give each chapter to describe what's inside?" Please see Appendix A for meeting notes and Appendix D for a table depicting the attributes or values and the "chapter titles" the Focus Group created. The facilitator concluded the meeting by leading a brief reflection on the evening's work.

2. Focus Group, Meeting Two

The second Focus Group meeting was held a week later on Tuesday, March 14, 2006, from 6 o'clock pm until 9 o'clock pm at the Olympia School District's Knox Center. The facilitator

reminded the group of the focus question, and explained that the first objective of the evening would be to provide recommendations on which attributes should be analyzed quantitatively, and which were appropriate for qualitative analysis. He provided further explanation for the terms "quantitative" and "qualitative". He also pointed out that neither kind of analysis is better than the other and reminded the Focus Group that *all* of the attributes they identified would be analyzed in the NBA. Working in groups of three, the participants selected a cluster of attributes and worked together to decide whether to recommend quantitative or qualitative analysis. Both kinds of analysis were recommended for some attributes.

The facilitator described the focus question for the meeting's next activity: "How should the public be involved in the final decision making about the long-term management of Capitol lake?" The participants worked in groups of four or five to brainstorm and present their suggestions, which are captured in Appendix F.

The final activity of the evening was optional. Staff wished to collect as much detail as possible from the Focus Group participants regarding the attributes they identified, and so the facilitator asked the group to provide additional detail on the attribute cards. He described that the additional detail would be the recipe for that attribute card. These instructions would explain how the attribute could be measured in the NBA. Please see Appendix D for a table that depicts the attributes, the qualitative and quantitative recommendations, and the "recipe card" details.

Before adjourning, staff asked for volunteers to come to the public meeting to present the Focus Group's work and engage the public participants in discussion. Staff talked about the importance of having actual Focus Group participants present their work to the public. The meaning of the attributes the Focus Group identified, and the titles they gave the chapters would have more value when paraphrased by the participants themselves. Ten Focus Group members volunteered to present the group's work at the public meeting, and four more attended to engage in discussion. A meeting summary is available in Appendix B.

3. Public Meeting

The public meeting was held on Tuesday, March 21, 2006, from 6 o'clock pm until 9 o'clock pm at the Olympia School District's Knox Center. More than 70 people attended the meeting. A welcome from Peter Antolin, the Deputy Director of GA, was followed by the three presentations that staff gave at the first Focus Group meeting. Then the facilitator introduced the focus question and talked about the Focus Group meetings, after which Focus Group representatives took turns summarizing the content of the attribute chapters and the public involvement brainstorm. These presentations were followed by an impromptu question and answer period that covered issues related to the funding, objectives, and outcomes of the broader DEFS. Brief remarks from Linda Villegas Bremer, the Director of GA, marked the transition from presentations to workshop activities.

The facilitator invited the public to participate in the second half of the meeting, wherein they walked around the room to study the attribute cards, which were grouped by chapter and posted around the room. Focus Group participants acted as mentors for each chapter, and answered questions from the public. The public meeting participants posted cards with additional Deschutes Basin attributes (available in Appendix E) and further suggestions for public involvement in decision making (available in Appendix F). Because the single, three-hour time frame constrained the evening's activities, the public meeting participants were not asked to specify whether they thought their attributes should be qualitatively or quantitatively analyzed.

C. Results

1. Focus Group Attributes

The Focus Group achieved each of the three objectives set before them. They identified more than fifty attributes related to the Deschutes Basin that they felt should be included in the DEFS. They organized these attributes into eight categories and gave the categories creative names that described the value of those attributes to the group. The "Sustainable Future" chapter described the value of a place on the landscape that embodies a social, environmental, and economic balance. The chapter titled "Healthy Economy" captured a broad variety of attributes that contribute to the local economy, particularly a thriving downtown area and marine-related economic sector. "Everybody's Basin" identified the value of having a unique cultural amenity that is centrally located and used by many. The Focus Group identified attributes that depict close-in natural habitat that is accessible for people, plants, and animals, and called the chapter "Web of Life". In "Come Play Outside" the Focus Group listed the attributes that make the Deschutes Basin a place that can draw families, couples, and others to participate in a broad variety of outdoor activities. "It's the Water" captured attributes that represent the aesthetic value of water. The attributes, or values, in "From Here to There" focused on having physical connections throughout the Deschutes Basin

Table 1. Summary of Focus Group's Deschutes Basin attributes.

SUSTAINABLE FUTURE	HEALTHY ECONOMY	EVERYBODY'S BASIN	WEB OF LIFE	COME PLAY OUTSIDE	IT'S THE WATER	FROM HERE TO THERE	SPIRITUAL CONNECTIONS
A place to teach kids about nature	Safe haven for mooring boats	Unique cultural amenity (community celebrations, Capitol, history…)	Accessible, natural habitat close to downtown	Old Brewhouse becomes vital historical focal point	Aesthetic value of water	Connects Chehalis & Woodland Trails	A wonderful, broad learning experience
Model for thoughtful stewardship	Destination for visitors	"Central" public resource	Seasonal change	"Green Lake" atmosphere	Reflecting pond for our grand capitol	Various basin areas unique & integrated	Causes me to pause/ slow down
Risk management of water level rise (climate change)	Drawing card for economic activity	Shared community asset	Peaceful, beautiful, natural open space	Community events (Proc. of Species, Lakefair, Lighted Ships)	Views of Puget Sound & mountains	Waterway connects from West Bay to Falls	Spiritual connection to something larger
Demonstrates sustainable environmental practices	Not a large tax burden	Lake is point of civic pride	Ecological & social link to Puget Sound & Pacific Ocean	Expand and develop use	Castle @ St. Helier, Jersey, C.I.	All the improvements completed @ Heritage Park	Close-in, quiet space
Sustainable natural environment within an urban setting	Economic driver (inc. transportation, tourism, port, marine businesses, yacht club)	Waterway tells story of the history of the community	Wildlife habitat	Family & romantic getaway	A reflecting estuary for our Capitol		
Deal with sewage, pollution	Help keep downtown alive & healthy		A place to observe salmon	Walk, run safely			
Provide flood protection	Lake/estuary attracts downtown business		Honoring local (NW) flora & fauna	Picnicking & watching kids swim			
	Ecotourism and wildlife viewing		Extension of Puget Sound	Wonderful, safe area to exercise			
	Promotes water based activities			Canoe/kayak to experience tides			
				Swimming			
				Getaway boat fantasy			

KEY:

Quantitative Analysis
Qualitative Analysis
Both Recommended

(from the Tumwater Falls to West Bay Marina). The Focus Group designated the final chapter "Spiritual Connections" in recognition of the value of the Deschutes Basin to the human spirit.

The Focus Group fulfilled the second objective by working together to recommend qualitative or quantitative analysis for each attribute. The group recommended quantitative analysis for 47% of the attributes and qualitative analysis for 34% of the attributes. Participants recommended both kinds of analysis for the remaining 19% of the attributes. In addition, the Focus Group provided added detail to guide analysis for all but 7 of the 53 attributes. Appendix D contains all of the attributes sorted into their respective categories, the kind of analysis recommended for each attribute, and the additional investigative detail. The summary table is reproduced here as Table 1.

2. Public Meeting Attributes

The public meeting participants contributed to the first objective by providing many additional attributes in each of the eight categories. Several of their suggestions echoed or built upon ideas identified by the Focus Group. In addition, many public meeting participants described their attributes in sentences or long phrases. A handful of attributes had not been identified in the Focus Group, and thus added new dimensions to the categories. Some of these novel attributes included indigenous shellfish farming, Native American history, biodiversity, and existing infrastructure investments. A complete list of the attributes identified at the public meeting is presented in Appendix E. As mentioned above, the single, three-hour time frame constrained the evening's activities, and so public meeting participants were not asked to specify whether they thought their attributes should be qualitatively or quantitatively analyzed. Even so, the longer, narrative style of many of the public meeting participants' attributes provided detail that was useful in the context of the NBA.

3. Public Involvement Brainstorm

Finally, both the Focus Group and the public meeting participants created lengthy lists of public involvement suggestions that satisfied the third objective of the stakeholder involvement process. The Focus Group followed the ground rules of the brainstorming methodology closely (e.g., defer judgment, every idea is valid, quantity is wanted) and produced list of more than one hundred ideas about how the public could be involved in future decision making. In addition to suggestions related to decision-making, the Focus Group offered ideas about how to involve the public and disseminate information. The public meeting participants added 35 more suggestions. The complete list is available in Appendix F.

D. Integration with the Net Benefits Analysis

All of the attributes, the additional detail, and the qualitative and quantitative recommendations that the Focus Group and the public meeting participants created will help shape the scope of work of the impending NBA. All of this information will be included in the analysis and will continue to be part of the body of information that is being created about the estuary alternative for Capitol Lake.

In the course of the NBA, additional quantitative and qualitative information will be gathered to ensure that all possible changes in attributes are measured and/or described. In order for all of the attributes to receive due consideration in the NBA, staff must effectively communicate the particular meaning of that information to the economic and other social science experts that will conduct the analysis. To facilitate this communication, WDFW staff and NOAA CSC staff worked together (and with feedback from the Focus Group) to re-organize and "translate" the descriptive and informal language from the Focus Group and public meetings. This "translation" is in no way intended to replace, nor indicate the relative importance of, the particular attributes identified by the Focus Group and the public. Rather the translation is an effort to more concisely and clearly define

those attributes and group them based on the types of data that will be will collected during the formal economic assessment. This effort is summarized in Table 2. Please see Appendix G for the full socio-economic "translation" of Deschutes Basin attributes.

Table 2. Summary of "Translation" of Deschutes Basin attributes.

Benefit Category	*Description*
Outdoor Recreation	*The goods and services related to outdoor recreation were primarily captured in the focus group chapters entitled "Come Play Outside" and "From Here to There" and include both marine and land-based recreation activities*
Tourism	*The goods and services related to tourism were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled "Healthy Economy," "Everybody's Basin," and "Come Play Outside", specific examples cited included both traditional tourism (restaurants, retail establishments, and hotels) and ecotourism.*
Aesthetics and Spirituality	*The goods and services related to aesthetics and spirituality were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled "Healthy Economy," "It's the Water," and "Spiritual Connections." Participants attributed value to the basin's ability to promote a sense of place and self, its importance to wildlife, and more generally its connection to larger natural systems.*
Ecosystem Functions	*The goods and services related to ecosystem functions were generally captured in the focus group chapters "Sustainable Future," "Web of Life," and "It's the Water." These included risk management functions, biodiversity support, and consumptive uses (fish and shellfish).*
Cultural, Civic and Historical Pride	*The goods and services related to cultural, civic, and historical pride were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled "Everybody's Basin," "Web of Life," and "Come Play Outside". Participants identified the basin as a focal point for the area and viewed the basin as a place where the natural environment, history, and community could be displayed, protected, and honored.*
Education	*The goods and services related to education were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled "Sustainable Future" and "Everybody's Basin" and recognize the opportunity for students, residents, and tourists to learn about the natural environment, sustainable environmental practices, local and regional history, outdoor recreation, and relevant local natural resource issues.*
Marine Commerce	*The goods and services related to marine commerce were generally captured in the focus group chapter entitled "Healthy Economy", recognizing both the direct benefits provided by the Port of Olympia and the numerous businesses supported by marine traffic and commerce, including yacht clubs, boat repair and supply shops, grocery stores, and restaurants.*
Infrastructure	*The goods and services related to infrastructure were generally captured in the focus group chapters entitled "Sustainable Future," "Healthy Economy," and "Come Play Outside" and includes the dams, bridges, parkways, walkways, parks and roads associated with Capitol Lake and Budd Inlet.*

IV. Discussion

A. What worked well?

A variety of aspects of this stakeholder involvement process worked well, helping to achieve the desired outcomes. The most notable of these was working with an experienced professional facilitator who had an understanding of a variety of relevant local issues. The professional facilitator was a neutral focal point, which helped to establish a greater degree of trust and objectivity throughout the stakeholder involvement process. The facilitator was also a valuable addition to the WDFW and NOAA CSC staff team that worked together to design the stakeholder involvement process. Each person brought a particular expertise and perspective to the planning efforts, which resulted in more creative and effective activities and communications, as well as better results.

The process employed in the Focus Group meetings worked particularly well, and helped achieve very meaningful responses to the meeting objectives. The combination of individual, small team, and full group activities prescribed by the Workshop Method™ led the Focus Group to achieve their experiential objective: to enjoy working together in a cooperative atmosphere to evoke creative thinking and a sense of satisfaction from creating a visible product. Because of the cooperative atmosphere that evolved, Focus Group members concentrated their efforts on the rational objectives and produced very relevant products that provide much of the scope needed for the NBA.

The cooperative atmosphere that was established in the Focus Group meetings also had important educational value. Participants heard a variety of perspectives at the meetings, and left the process with a deeper understanding of the issues, historic perspectives, and a more thorough understanding of the studies and methods being employed. Each of the participants is now a community ambassador for the Capitol Lake Adaptive Management Plan and the DEFS.

The techniques employed in soliciting participation for both the Focus Group process and the public meeting were also effective when judged by the high and diverse attendance at all meetings. Eighty-nine percent (25 of 28) of the organizations and individuals invited to participate in the Focus Group attended the first meeting. It is possible that the combination of direct calls and emails, formal invitation letters, and some follow-up from CLAMP Steering Committee members brought about the high attendance rate. It may also mean that the community was very anxious for the opportunity to engage on the topic of Capitol Lake management.

While none of the methods used to advertise the public meeting were innovative (e.g., newspaper article, radio spot, fliers), more than 70 people attended the meeting. This number is somewhat higher than past public meetings related to Capitol Lake. Again, it is possible that the community was very anxious for the opportunity to engage on the subject. It is also possible that the level of ownership that Focus Group participants felt in the process and outcomes led them to encourage others to attend. As mentioned above, this meant that information about the meeting was distributed to a secondary layer of people and organizations.

Finally, the public involvement brainstorm was an unexpected success. In addition to providing some excellent fodder for discussions about the eventual decision making regarding the long-term management of Capitol Lake, the stakeholders provided many practicable communication and outreach suggestions. These suggestions are relevant for the Deschutes Estuary Feasibility Study, but also for the CLAMP Steering Committee in general. The Steering Committee recently reinstated a Communications Subcommittee, which will use the public involvement brainstorm as it revisits the overall communication strategy.

B. What could be improved?

Although the stakeholder involvement process led to fulfillment of each of the three objectives, several aspects of the process could be improved. It would be beneficial to select and engage with a facilitator earlier in the planning process. A professional facilitator could have made helpful suggestions with regard to selecting participants and choosing the number and sequence of meetings. In addition, it would be valuable for the facilitator to participate in, or at least be privy to, the discussions about the meeting objectives. The facilitator could have helped with the wording and, alternately, the discussion may have assisted in the formation of the focus question.

In addition, the structure of the public meeting was not very effective. In contrast to the Focus Group meetings, where the group fulfilled experiential objective of cooperation and satisfaction in the product, the presentations and loose open house format of the public meeting did almost nothing to achieve the experiential objective. As a result, the feedback from the public meeting was less focused and less relevant to the objective at hand. The public meeting participants were not able to establish a rapport and sense of trust with the facilitator or with each other. Because this atmosphere was missing, public meeting participants were not responsive to the facilitator's efforts to manage the agenda and objectives (as evidenced by the impromptu and off-track question and answer period). Staff recommends implementing the Workshop Method™ and Focus Group activities with a broader set of public participants, dispensing with the separate small group and public meetings.

V. Conclusion

By most measures, the Net Benefits Analysis stakeholder involvement process was successful. It accomplished the three rational objectives: identify attributes related to the Deschutes Basin that should be included in the NBA, recommend quantitative or qualitative analysis for each attribute, and make suggestions about how the public could be involved in future decision making regarding the long-term management of Capitol Lake. The products associated with each of these objectives will shape the investigation and evaluation within the NBA, as well as future communication and public involvement related to broader Capitol Lake issues. All of these efforts contribute to the consideration of the human and social aspects of Capitol Lake and Deschutes Basin management and, hopefully, more sustainable decisions for the management of this coastal area.

Perhaps more significantly, the Focus Group meeting fulfilled its experiential objective. As many of them told WDFW staff, the Focus Group participants enjoyed working together in a cooperative atmosphere, which evoked creative thinking and a sense of satisfaction from creating a visible product. This sense of cooperation and of understanding is a small step toward a sustainable solution for managing Capitol Lake: a solution that transcends the deep-seated and diametrically opposed positions. As Linda Villegas Bremer, the director of GA, remarked at the public meeting, "Perhaps there is a solution that is richer than those we understand today, and can meet all of the community's needs."

VI. References

Casagrande, D. (1997). "The Human Component of Urban Wetland Restoration." *The Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies Bulletin*, Vol. 100: 254 – 270.

Casagrande, D. (1997b). "Values, Perceptions, and Restoration Goals." *The Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies Bulletin*, Vol. 100: 62-75.

De Groot, R. S., M. A. Wilson, & R. M. J. Boumans. (2002). "A typology for the classification, description, and valuation of ecosystem functions, goods and services." *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 41: 393-408.

Driver, B. L. (1996). "Benefits-Driven Management of Natural Areas." *Natural Areas Journal*, Vol. 16: 94-99.

Ebbin, S. A. (2002). "Enhanced fit through institutional interplay in the Pacific Northwest Salmon co-management regime." *Marine Policy*, Vol. 26: 253-259.

Garkovich, Lorraine. (online). "The meaning of land in American society." http://www.landfilm.com/meaning2.html

Lipton, D. W. & K. W. Wellman. (1995). *Economic Valuation of Natural Resources: A Handbook for Coastal Resource Policy Makers*. Silver Spring, MD: NOAA Coastal Ocean Program Decision Analysis Series No. 5.

H. J. Heinz Center. (2002). *Dam Removal: Science and Decision Making.* Washington, DC: H. J. Heinz Center for Science, Economics, and the Environment.

Imperial, M. T. (2005). "Using Collaboration as a Governance Strategy: Lessons from Six Watershed Management Programs." *Administration & Society*, Vol. 37 No. 3:281-320.

McCool, S. F. & K. Gutherie. (2001). "Mapping the Dimensions of Successful Public Participation in Messy Natural Resource Management Situations." *Society and Natural Resource Management*, Vol. 14: 309-323.

Page, C. (1997). "Predicting the Social Impacts of Restoration in an Urban Park." *The Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies Bulletin*, Vol. 100: 76-102.

Standfield, R. Brian (2002). *The Workshop Book: From Independent Creativity to Group Action*. Gabriola Island, Canada: New Society Publishers.

Thayer, G. W., T. A. McTigue, R. Salz, D. H. Merkey, F. M. Burrows, & P. F. Gayaldo, (eds.). (2005). "Science-Based Restoration Monitoring of Coastal Habitats – Volume II: Tools for Monitoring Coastal Habitats." Silver Spring, MD: NOAA Coastal Ocean Program.

Waage, S. (2003). "Collaborative Salmon Recovery Planning: Examining Decision Making and Implementation in Northeastern Oregon." *Society and Natural Resource Management*, Vol. 16: 295-307.